UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/580,382	02/12/2007	William A. Nicol	2000-1220-PCT8-US	1745	
30184 MYERS & KA	7590 05/16/200 PLAN	EXAMINER			
	AL PROPERTY LAW	LUK, EMMANUEL S			
= =	CUMBERLAND CENTER II 3100 CUMBERLAND BLVD , SUITE 1400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA, GA	ATLANTA, GA 30339			1791	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			05/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/580,382	NICOL ET AL			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Emmanuel S. Luk	1791			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Jules</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 22 May 2006 is/are: a)	r election requirement. r.	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the orection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/24/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

Application/Control Number: 10/580,382 Page 2

Art Unit: 1791

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kachnic (5928578) in view of Williamson (5514309).

Kachnic teaches an injection molding machine 10 with the mold halves 14, 16, sensor 20 (electronic camera), controller 70 that operates via electrical interface 72 to the machine 10, the images are compared by a computer or microprocessor (Col. 6, lines 21-24), the analyzing means compares it with memory 73, and sends signals of when to open and close the mold via processor 72.

Kachnic fails to teach an infrared sensor/thermograph.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,382 Page 3

Art Unit: 1791

Williamson teaches the use of a heat sensor 33, an infrared heat sensor, that detects the changes in temperature. Williamson also teaches sensors 52 that are connected to the program controller 55. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kachnic with infrared sensors as taught by Williamson because it allows for detection of the cooling of the part. The image of the procured from the heat sensor would be compared and analyzed similar to the images detected by the electronic camera of Kachnic for finding the comparison and sending a signal accordingly from the processor to the molding machine.

Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kieras 6221189 and Watanabe 2003/0194660.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (571)272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,382 Page 4

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yogendra N Gupta/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

EL